

The Society for Historians of American
Foreign Relations



NEWSLETTER

Volume 30

No. 2

June 1999

Page

- 1 Expanding the Horizons of the *Foreign Relations* Series by
David S. Patterson
- 17 A Letter from *David S. Foglesong*
- 25 Closed Windows and Open Doors: A Report on Holt
Sponsored Research in the People's Republic of China by
Xiaodong Wang
- 30 Announcements
- 35 Publications
- 39 Calendar
- 40 Personals
- 40 Awards, Prizes, and Funds
-

ISSN 0740-6169

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Founded in 1967

Chartered in 1972

PRESIDENT: Walter LaFeber, History, Cornell, Ithaca, NY 14853.

VICE PRESIDENT: Robert Schulzinger, History, Colorado, Boulder CO 80309.

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY-TREASURER: Allan Spetter, History, Wright State University, Dayton OH 45435.

PROGRAM COMMITTEE: Steven Schwartzberg, P.O. Box 208206, New Haven, CT 06520-8206.

CHAIR, NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE: Douglas Little, History, Clark U., 950 Main St., Worcester, MA 01610

FINANCE COMMITTEE: Robert Schulzinger, History, U. of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80309.

MEMBERSHIP: Annual dues are \$30 for regular members and \$15 for student or unemployed (unemployed rate valid for two years). Institutional Subscription Rates for *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 20, 1996 are \$75 for institutions in North America and \$90 for institutions in the rest of the world. Make checks payable to Blackwell Publishers or use MasterCard, Visa, or American Express. Mail orders, payments, and address changes to: SHAFR Membership Coordinator, Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St, Malden, MA 02148 or call 1-800-835-6770. For those wishing only to receive the *Newsletter* the cost is \$15.00. Overseas members wishing to receive the *Newsletter* by air mail should remit an additional \$10 per year to the *Newsletter's* office.

MEETINGS: The annual meeting of the Society is held in the summer. The Society also meets with the AHA in January.

PRIZES: The Society administers four awards that honor the late Stuart L. Bernath and two honoring the late Myrna L. Bernath; these are financed through the generosity of the late Dr. Gerald J. Bernath. Awards also honor Laura and Norman Graebner, the late W. Stull Holt, the late Warren Kuehl, the late Armin Rappaport, Robert Ferrell, Lawrence Gelfand, and Arthur Link. Details of each of these awards are to be found in the June and December *Newsletters*.

PUBLICATIONS: The Society sponsors a quarterly *Newsletter*; *Diplomatic History*, a journal; and the occasional *Membership Roster and List of Current Research Projects*.

The SHAFR Website can be reached at:
<http://www.ohiou.edu/~shafr/shafr.htm>

EXPANDING THE HORIZONS OF THE *FOREIGN
RELATIONS* SERIES

by
David S. Patterson*

Introduction

To the superficial eye, the published volumes in the *Foreign Relations of the United States* series over the past generation may appear to have continued to present the official documentary record of U.S. foreign policy without any real changes in format and content. Outwardly, to be sure, the most recent volumes have the same ruby buckram covers with gold trim and lettering as their predecessors of 25 years ago. Inside, too, each of the current books is still packed with about 800-1,000 pages of printed documents, with explanatory front matter and an index. And while many of the newer volumes have more editorial notes summarizing episodes and

*Deputy Historian and General Editor of the *Foreign Relations* Series, Office of the Historian, U.S. Department of State. The views in this article do not necessarily represent those of the Department of State.

relevant repositories for further research and more elaborate footnotes, the editorial style remains largely unchanged.

Nevertheless, the *Foreign Relations* series is not a static enterprise. Continuity persists; but as seasoned users already know, changes have also occurred. Among the new features, I consider the widening range of research by our State Department historians, who compile the volumes, as the most significant new development in the preparation of the series in the 1990s.

Expanded Research Horizons

In a sense, the changes over the last decade are part of an ongoing, incremental process, only now much accelerated, of expanding the parameters of our research. Thus while the 1970s and 1980s showed the first major forays beyond Department of State files into the classified Department of Defense and Joint Chiefs of Staff records and, most crucially, the extensive White House records at the presidential libraries, in the 1990s our State Department historian-compilers also began for the first time systematically to investigate the records of the Treasury and Commerce Departments, Agency for International Development, U.S. Information Agency, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and National Aeronautics and Space Administration. They also delved into many more private collections. The historians compiling the most recent volumes on Vietnam, for instance, perused the personal papers of Henry Cabot Lodge, Averell Harriman, Paul Nitze, and Generals Edward Lansdale, Lyman

Lemnitzer, Andrew Goodpaster, Maxwell Taylor, William Westmoreland, and Creighton Abrams, among others.¹

The Intelligence Record

I believe, however, that two new research frontiers are the most important: the intelligence record and the White House tape recordings. The significance is that both kinds of records are extensive and inclusive. In other words, they provide additional perspective and new detail about a large number of foreign policy subjects and thus complement the other documentary coverage. Our historians' access to these new materials did not come about easily. For the intelligence record of the U.S. Government, one reason for our expanded access was the fallout from the volumes covering the first years of the Eisenhower administration on Iran and Guatemala.² Although our historians tried to get access to the CIA files, they were refused, and we could not get other documents on the covert actions declassified. In consequence, the record when published contained very little or nothing about the U.S. covert actions to overthrow Mossadegh in Iran and Arbenz in Guatemala, and the volumes were obvious distortions of U.S. foreign policy. These two examples were symptomatic of a broader problem of lack of access to the intelligence record in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy.

¹*Foreign Relations*, 1964-1968, Vol. IV, Vietnam 1966 (1998); and *Foreign Relations*, Vol. V, Vietnam 1967 (in process). The publisher of all *Foreign Relations* volumes is the Government Printing Office in Washington, D.C.

²*Foreign Relations*, 1951-1954, Vol. X, Iran (1989); and *ibid.*, Vol. IV, Latin America (1984).

The most important result of these failings was the passage by Congress of a 1991 law, which mandates that the *Foreign Relations* series “shall be a thorough, accurate, and reliable documentary record of major United States foreign policy decisions and significant diplomatic activity.” Moreover, the statute also requires State Department historians to have “full access to the original, unrevised records” in preparing *Foreign Relations* volumes.³ Although the CIA was already providing access to more of its records for research by our historians, the legislation surely hastened and broadened the process. The law also provides that the Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation should monitor all aspects of the *Foreign Relations* series, and the committee has interpreted its mandate to include our historians’ full access to the foreign policy records of all government agencies. It is fair to say, I think, that the statutory authority of the advisory committee — and the willingness of the committee to invoke it — has made government departments more responsive and cooperative in meeting our historians’ research needs. Even the most secret agencies, the National Security Agency and the National Reconnaissance Office (whose existence was only first officially acknowledged in 1991), began to provide access to our researchers. The fruits of research in these agencies may be marginal for understanding past U.S. foreign policy, but they have provided a fuller perspective on issues of national security policy and added in-depth detail to events like the *Liberty* (1967) and *Pueblo* (1968) incidents.

A second reason was the end of the Cold War. With the demise of the Soviet empire, the veil of secrecy that had previously surrounded the U.S. Government lifted slightly. The State Department set an example in the early 1990s when

³P.L. 102-138, approved October 28, 1991; 105 Stat. 685.

the Bureau of Intelligence and Research gave us access to its well-organized papers of the 5412 Group and the 303 Committee, the high-level interagency mechanisms that approved and monitored the government's covert action programs during the Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson administrations. Also in response to this new openness, in 1994 the Central Intelligence Agency declassified about 80 national intelligence estimates covering Soviet strategic capabilities from the 1950s-1980s. Moreover, Directors of Central Intelligence Robert Gates and James Woolsey acknowledged eleven past covert actions of the U.S. Government from the late 1940s to early 1960s and intimated that intelligence documentation on these activities would be released. A pioneering landmark was the Agency's cooperation in making available to us extensive files on the emergence of the intelligence establishment following the Second World War for a special *Foreign Relations* volume published in 1996.⁴ By then, cooperation between our compilers and the CIA historians at the Center for the Study of Intelligence had improved; and as the CIA historians better understand our expanded research interests, they have been more proactive in trying to give our historians the fullest access to CIA records on intelligence activity, including covert action. More recently, the National Security Council opened its files to us for the same 5412 and 303 Committees, and we concluded an access agreement with the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.⁵ We are also cooperating with

⁴*Foreign Relations, 1945-1950, The Emergence of the Intelligence Establishment* (1996).

⁵The specific terms of State Department historians' access to the foreign policy records of other government agencies are spelled out in each case in a memorandum of understanding between the Office of the Historian and the agency.

the CIA in planning a second *Foreign Relations* volume on the development of the intelligence community from 1950-1960, and a retrospective volume on Guatemala, 1952-1954 to fill in large gaps on the covert activity in that country.

Presidential Tape Recordings

Our historians also were given permission to listen to President Johnson's tape recordings. Because these tapes were not supposed to be opened until 50 years after Johnson's death, we were very fortunate that the director of the Lyndon B. Johnson Library removed this restriction so that our historians could gain access to the tapes beginning in late 1994 (only 21 years after Johnson died).⁶ We now know that there are tape recordings of every American president from Franklin Roosevelt through Richard Nixon, but the greatest number — and those which currently affect the *Foreign Relations* series — were made by Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon. It should be noted that for all the presidents only a very few of the participants at most knew that the president was taping their conversations.

The tape recordings raise several important questions for historians: How did these recordings first come to light? What were the motivations of the presidents who made them? What kind of taping systems did each president use? How were the recording devices activated? How many conversations were recorded, and how many hours of tapes are there? What is the audio quality? Are there any verbatim

⁶For a convenient summary of the decision at the Lyndon B. Johnson Library to open the tapes gradually to the public, see Michael R. Beschloss, ed., *Taking Charge: The Johnson White House Tapes, 1963-1964* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1977), 747-551.

transcripts or written summaries of the tapes? How many of the tapes and transcripts are now publicly available, and are there schedules for further release? What ethical questions does taping without the knowledge of those being taped raise? Finally, how important are the tapes for understanding the foreign policies of these administrations?⁷

Here, however, I'll focus mainly on the Johnson tapes to illustrate the relevance of the recordings to the *Foreign Relations* series and the challenges to State Department historians in using them effectively. While President Johnson recorded more than 80 Cabinet Room meetings in 1968, almost all of his tapes consist of telephone conversations. Although various reasons have been advanced to explain his decision to tap his own phone, one motive probably was to preserve an accurate historical record, which he could later use in writing his memoirs.

I don't want to exaggerate the importance of the Johnson tapes. The bedrock of *Foreign Relations* research has always been and continues to be the tens of thousands of paper documents that the State Department historians copy in the course of their multiarchival research. Tapes are no substitute for the rich abundance of manuscript materials, which provide the dense, incremental record of policy formulation, options, and decisions. Even in so-called "crisis" compilations where President Johnson was deeply involved in day-to-day discussions of events and policy alternatives, the proportion of space given to the transcripts and summaries of tape

⁷Stephanie Fawcett, Senior Archivist at the John F. Kennedy Library, and Regina Greenwell, Senior Archivist at the Lyndon B. Johnson Library, who have been preparing the Kennedy and Johnson tapes respectively for eventual release, discussed these questions and others in papers given at the SHAFR annual meeting at Georgetown University in June 1997.

recordings probably does not exceed 10 percent of the total pages in any *Foreign Relations* volume, and the average is probably closer to two percent. With the exception of two recordings of Executive Committee meetings during the Cuban missile crisis, we published the volumes on the Kennedy administration without using any tapes, to which we were granted only very belated and partial access. Because of time constraints, we also published the first Johnson volumes, including those covering the pivotal 1964-1965 years on Vietnam, without transcripts of any tapes, which were just becoming available.

The Johnson tapes do supplement the written documentary record, however, in some interesting ways, and since the earliest Johnson volumes we have had good access to the tapes to cover our needs for the manuscripts that had not been completed. First, because Johnson did not express himself in writing and used the telephone as his preferred instrument of communication, many of these conversations are significant in revealing or clarifying his views on major foreign policy questions and his strategy and tactics in pursuit of his goals. Second, they assume added importance because of the large number of them — thousands of conversations totaling approximately 640 hours. (It would take one individual nearly four months on non-stop listening, 40 hours each week, to hear all the tapes.) Whatever else you can say about Johnson, he was not one to do things halfway. He thus recorded not only Oval Office conversations beginning on the evening of November 22, 1963, when he returned from the tragic events in Dallas to Washington as president, but he also had taping systems installed in his bedroom of the White House Mansion, at Camp David, and in his office and bedroom at the LBJ ranch. (Of course, because Johnson decided when to activate the taping system, except when secretaries inadvertently left the system on, it's possible he may have recorded selectively

to show himself in a more positive light. With the exception of one tape conversation that Johnson destroyed soon after it was recorded, however, there is no evidence, unlike the Kennedy and Nixon tapes, that his recorded talks were later tampered with or deleted.)

Until fully reviewed by archivists at the Johnson Library, it is difficult to say how many of these phone talks deal with foreign affairs issues, but the number is surely large enough to keep diplomatic historians busy for some time. The White House Situation Room also independently taped conversations during the events leading to U.S. military intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965.

As time permitted, the president's secretarial staff prepared verbatim transcripts or summaries of 40 percent of the taped conversations (which Johnson later consulted in writing his memoirs),⁸ but these documents contain numerous errors and are not reliable. Accordingly, our historians, sometimes ably assisted by archivists at the Johnson Library, have prepared their own transcripts or summaries for their volumes. Fortunately, for the telephone conversations the recording device was connected directly to the White House phone, and the overall quality is fairly good. Nevertheless, transcribing is a very labor-intensive process, and our historian-compilers do not have the luxury of listening and transcribing indefinitely. They have thus done a lot of listening, but they have had to be selective in writing transcripts or summaries,

⁸*The Vantage Point: Perspectives of the Presidency 1963-1969* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971). He occasionally had transcripts made as president for reference purposes. See Beschloss, *Taking Charge*, p. 549.

concentrating on key conversations involving crises and decision-making.

What crises and decisions do the tapes cover? There are, of course, many on the Vietnam War. The recently published volume on Vietnam 1966 includes summaries and transcripts of 17 telephone conversations, and the 1967 volume will include extracts from or references to nearly 30 phone talks.⁹ But if Johnson was preoccupied with Vietnam, he did not ignore other foreign policy issues and in fact often became deeply engaged in them. To cite just a few examples, the tapes show that he micro-managed the U.S. military interventions in Panama and the Dominican Republic, U.S. policy toward Cuba, and the response to the famine in India. Even when used more sparingly, as in the Six Day War (for some reason, the number of taped conversations fall off markedly in 1967), the tapes still amplify the historical record and contribute to a fuller understanding of the policy or event.

The tapes contain less discussion of other geographical areas, but they help to confirm his intimate involvement in the development of his administration's arms control and national security policies. They cover, for example, Johnson's reflections on his Glassboro meeting with Soviet Chairman Kosygin. The Cabinet Room tapes also recapture in considerable detail his response to the Warsaw Pact forces' invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. Among other things, they show that when Ambassador Dobrynin brought the news of the invasion to the American president, Johnson was preoccupied with the proposed announcement the next day of his summit meeting later that year with Kosygin, perhaps to provide some final luster to his failed administration, that

⁹See footnote 1 above.

he only gradually realized that the Czech crisis precluded further immediate talk of détente.¹⁰

Finally, the tapes offer fascinating glimpses into Lyndon Johnson's personality. I believe they reveal, in case anyone doubted it, that he was indeed a complex person — often thoughtful, restrained, generous, even magnanimous, at other times insecure, emotional, irascible, mean-spirited, and slightly paranoid. He was indeed a conflicted human being, taking on elements of a Shakespearian tragic figure. This depiction of Johnson is hardly surprising; it tends to confirm what other professional historians, perhaps most recently Michael Beschloss and Robert Dallek, have written about him.¹¹ Unfortunately, written transcripts cannot fully recapture the mood of the participants or their symbiotic or strained relationships. And while the historian can provide valuable context in explanatory notes and footnotes, there is no substitute to listening to the tapes, sometimes several times, to begin to understand who Lyndon Johnson was and what it was like to have to deal with him on matters of high policy. Except perhaps for small extracts withheld for privacy or national security reasons, all the Johnson tapes will gradually be opened to the public, and perhaps eventually some enterprising scholars will make available to the interested public complete, unabridged versions in both audio and printed formats. In the meantime, the *Foreign Relations* series will include accounts of many of these talks, and I

¹⁰*Foreign Relations, 1964-1968, Vol. XVII, Eastern Europe, Austria, Finland (1996)*, pp. 236ff. Despite late administration's efforts to revive the U. S.-Soviet summit, it was not held.

¹¹Beschloss, *Taking Charge, passim*; Robert Dallek, *Flawed Giant Lyndon Johnson and His Times, 1961-1973* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998).

believe that in the long term the volumes, with the transcripts, will provide the fullest documentary record of the foreign policies of the Lyndon Johnson administration.

Other Recent Developments

Our historians are now engaged in research on the first Nixon administration (1969-1972), and they uniformly believe that the Nixon papers, currently at the National Archives in College Park, are a treasure trove for researchers. The Nixon materials are much more voluminous than those at the Johnson Library; and perhaps because nearly all important foreign policy matters under President Nixon were managed by him and Henry Kissinger, his National Security Adviser, the paper trail is exceedingly dense. Moreover, many of the documents are filled with a lot of marginalia by Nixon, Kissinger, and their assistants. In addition, there are the Kissinger Papers and the transcripts of his telephone conversations at the Library of Congress, although it is too early to assess their historical importance.

Then there are the infamous Nixon tapes.¹² Nixon initially rejected proposals to tape his conversations; but when he changed his mind in early 1971, he recorded, as we now know, with a vengeance. His taping systems were voice-activated, so virtually everything that was said in the Oval Office and the Executive Office Building and at Camp David was recorded. The result is nearly 4,000 hours of tapes, or four times what Johnson recorded, although Nixon taped for only two-plus years compared with Johnson's five. A log

¹²For a recent account of the background, see Stanley I. Kutler, ed., *Abuse of Power: The New Nixon Tapes* (New York: The Free Press, 1997), pp. xiii-xxiii and 1-2.

listing the participants and the subjects in the tapes, which the National Archives prepared, totals 27,000 pages! While this guide is indispensable to identify the dates and locations of meetings, subjects, and participants, it is also a daunting responsibility for our historians. While they may patiently peruse the log, they will surely have to be selective in the recordings they listen to. Moreover, because most of the conversations are of meetings rather than telephone conversations, the sound quality is very uneven and often inaudible, which may mean a lot of time and effort for small returns on many subjects.

Two other new research areas in the *Foreign Relations* series deserve mention. One is the expanded coverage to global issues — that is, functional subjects involving more than individual countries or regions that received considerable attention from policymakers. The increased number of pages given to monetary, trade, and other foreign economic policies for the Johnson and first Nixon administrations — two thick volumes for each compared with one for comparable periods of the Eisenhower and Kennedy years — is one example. I'm thinking here, however, less of more intensive coverage of traditional subjects than of expanding the range of subject matter. Of course, *Foreign Relations* volumes have already devoted space to some relatively new topics — for example, science, law of the sea, population, and narcotics, going back at least to the Kennedy administration — but these subject areas and others like human rights, expropriation, and terrorism became much more important foreign policy issues beginning with the Nixon administration and continuing into the late 1970s and beyond. Responding to these important changes, we hope to prepare volumes on the Nixon and Ford administrations that will provide much more coverage to these global concerns.

The second is the inclusion of compilations on the organization and administration of foreign policy. Each new administration somehow thinks it can organize and manage foreign policy more efficiently and with more productive results than its predecessors. Some senior government officials spent considerable time during the 1960s and 1970s in devising new agencies or bureaucratic mechanisms and writing presidential directives to help their administrations achieve their policy goals. We began separate compilations on the organization and management of foreign policy with the Kennedy administration, whose principles assumed office believing a major overhaul of the Eisenhower foreign policy structure was required. The result was a reorganization of the National Security Council and the creation of new agencies such as the Agency for International Development, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Peace Corps. We are continuing this new practice for the Johnson and Nixon administrations, but we are expanding the documentation on issues such as the role of the State Department and the Foreign Service in policy formulation and implementation.

Part of this effort also involves the role of intelligence in the making of U.S. foreign policy. From our experience in preparing the postwar retrospective volume on the organization and administration of intelligence, we are more sensitive to the various mechanisms policymakers devised to try to integrate intelligence analysis and covert activity into the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign policies. Fortunately, a few of our historians seem to enjoy research on organizational issues and have shown imagination and perseverance in searching out little used and seemingly arcane administrative collections for their documentary accounts.

The identification of new topics for possible coverage will continue in the future. We are looking now into social-

cultural issues, such as immigration policy, refugees, and information policy, which have been largely neglected in the series. Such compilations will not necessarily provide comprehensive documentation or even a “story” but will present, I hope, at least a few key documents for publication which, together with footnotes and editorial and bibliographic notes, will guide serious scholars to some important archival sources for in-depth historical research.

Present and Future Challenges

My main argument here has been that the State Department historians have expanded the research horizons of the *Foreign Relations* series in the 1990s and have raised the coverage of the published volumes to a new level. There are tradeoffs, however. One is that because the number of volumes (i.e., pages per documented year) has actually declined slightly, our historians are hard pressed to find ways to compress more information on more subjects into the same or less space. The growing number of editorial notes and footnotes in recent volumes are designed to lead the interested reader to other documents and collections on subjects that can not be covered in detail.

An even greater concern, I think, is that the additional research in many more manuscript collections and repositories, the transcribing of tape recordings, and the expanded number of new subjects have increased the compiling time for almost every volume, yet the *1991 Foreign Relations* statute also requires that the “series shall be published not more than 30 years after the events recorded.” To be sure, many Johnson volumes have been delayed because of disputes with government agencies over declassification, and we find ourselves between a rock and a hard place. On the one hand, because the law requires a full and accurate

documentary record, we cannot publish volumes until we have exhausted the time-consuming process of appealing negative declassification reviews and are finally satisfied that the declassified texts meet the comprehensive requirement of the law. On the other hand, the arduous and lengthy declassification process inevitably delays publication, sometimes well beyond the statutory mandate of 30 years.

But even if the declassification issues should be resolved much more quickly (and I think we are making genuine progress in this area), we would still be hard pressed to come close to the 30-year line, and the increased time in researching and compiling the documentary record puts us in real danger of falling much further behind. Diplomatic historians of the Cold War may feel the same dilemma: They may welcome the publication of the fullest possible documentary record on the broadest range of subjects, but for understandable, sometimes self-interested reasons they also want the timely publication of *Foreign Relations* volumes.

Without the prospect of additional personnel and a larger budget, the leadership in the State Department's Office of the Historian has to consider new management techniques over all phases of *Foreign Relations* volumes to utilize its available resources in the most efficient manner. We also need to consider new, yet realistic ways to publish the foreign affairs record more expeditiously. We have begun in fact to review many phases of the *Foreign Relations* series and with the active engagement of our advisory committee are considering several possible innovations, including online documentary editions and supplements on the Internet, to accelerate and streamline the publication of the series without compromising its comprehensive and expanded coverage. You will doubtless hear more about this important rethinking exercise as we get more deeply into it.

LETTERS

To the Editor:

In a recent effort to reclaim Woodrow Wilson's historical reputation from the tarnish of "realist" and "revisionist" criticism, David Steigerwald goes to some lengths to dispute my analysis of Wilsonian intervention in Soviet Russia, particularly by ridiculing one idea that is not central to my book — the notion that Wilson's "racism infused his policy toward the Russian civil war." After quoting a passage from *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism* in which I dared to suggest that Wilson, like other Americans, might have compared the tumult in revolutionary Russia (where illiterate descendants of serfs were often called "dark people") to disorder in the Reconstruction-era South, Steigerwald writes that he "cannot recall any widespread tendency to equate serfdom and slavery" and asks "to be enlightened here."¹ I would like to oblige Steigerwald on that point, respond to some of his distortion of my work, and briefly address the underlying issue of contextualization of Wilsonian policy toward Russia.

Although I wish I could take Steigerwald's mocking query whether the equation of serfdom to slavery "was a habit of mind that only Foglesong has yet discerned" as a tribute to my originality, it is more a mark of his ignorance. If

¹David Steigerwald, "The Reclamation of Woodrow Wilson?" *Diplomatic History*, Vol.23, No 1 (Winter 1999), 79-99. Steigerwald's comments on *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism: U.S. Intervention in the Russian Civil War, 1917-1920* (Chapel Hill, 1995), appear on pages 87-91 of his review essay.

Steigerwald is truly interested in being enlightened, he might start with one of the sources I cited in connection with the passage he singled out: Larry Rand's description of how American abolitionists equated the liberation of Russian serfs by Tsar Alexander II in 1861 with the duty to emancipate Southern slaves, how magazines such as Harper's Weekly subsequently hailed the fact that "the Russians serfs, like the American Negroes, are receiving their liberty," and how prominent figures such as U.S. Minister to St. Petersburg Cassius Marcellus Clay defined serfdom as "white slavery." While Southerners disputed the parallel between serfdom and slavery in the 1860s, in previous decades proslavery writers sometimes cited Russian serfdom to support their arguments, as Peter Kolchin noted in an important comparative study. In 1858, for example, Georgian T. R. R. Cobb asserted that Russian serfs were "contented with their lot ... indolent, ... [and] mendacious, beyond the negro perhaps... ." ² For additional examples of implicit and explicit comparisons of Russian peasants to American slaves, Steigerwald might consider the young John Quincy Adams' declaration in 1783 that "The [Russian] nation is wholly composed of nobles and serfs, or in other words, of masters and slaves"; or South Carolina native and U.S. Minister to Russia Henry Middleton's conclusion in 1825 that autocracy was the only fitting government for Russia because of the "besotted ignorance" and "slavish obedience" of the masses; or James Buchanan's report from St. Petersburg that "the mass of this

² "America Views Russian serf Emancipation, 1861," *Mid-America*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (January 1968), 42-51; Peter Kolchin, "In Defense of Servitude: American Proslavery and Russian Proserfdom Arguments, 1760-1860," *American Historical Review*, Vol. 85, No.4 (1980), 814n; Kolchin, *Unfree Labor: American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge, MA, 1987), 172. See also C. Vann Woodward, "The Lash and the Knout," in Woodward, *The Future of the Past* (New York, 1989), 175-6.

people, composed as it is of ignorant and superstitious barbarians, who are also slaves, is not fit for political freedom.”³

If Steigerwald wants to see how Americans drew parallels between freed serfs and freed slaves in the late nineteenth century, he might pick up Russian Nihilism and Exile Life in Siberia (1883), in which journalist James W. Buel expressed disdain for the “loitering indifference” of peasants in a “serf settlement” that resembled “the negro log cabins still found on our Southern plantations.” Alternatively, Steigerwald might check out translator Isabel F. Hapgood’s Russian Rambles (1895), in which she announced that “Russians are as fond of watermelons as are the American negroes” and proclaimed that “all the ex-serfs with whom I talked retained a soft spot in their hearts for the comforts and irresponsibility of the good old days of serfdom.” Hapgood made the political implications of such comparisons explicit when she declared in *The Nation* that “Americans who are conversant with the negro problem of the South will find no difficulty in understanding” that Russian landowners were compelled to take radical steps to curb “the peasants’ abuse of electoral rights.”⁴

³Middleton’s dispatches are reproduced in Marc Raeff, “An American View of the Decembrist Revolt,” *Journal of Modern History*, Vol.25, No.3 (September 1953), 286-293; Adams’s letter and Buchanan’s report to President Andrew Jackson are quoted by David Mayers in *The Ambassadors and America’s Soviet Policy* (New York, 1995), 17, 25.

⁴Isabel Hapgood, “Stepniak’s Last Work,” *The Nation*, Vol. 62, No.1596 (January 30, 1896), 104. For further examples of the tendency of Russophiles to compare Russian peasants to African Americans, see Julian Ralph, “The Czar’s People,” *Harper’s New Monthly Magazine*, Vol. XCVII (June 1898), 19-20; and George Frederick Wright, *Asiatic Russia* (New York, 1902), in which the Oberlin-trained minister, geologist, and

Finally, if Steigerwald would like an illustration of how the supposed similarity between ordinary Russians and African Americans remained a live issue in the Wilson era, he might look at the way George Kennan, the famous crusader against the Siberian exile system, sought to dispel popular stereotypes of Russians. In 1914, trying to refute suspicions that Russians passively submitted to barbarous tsarist injustice, Kennan informed the editor and readers of *The Outlook* that “They tolerate it only in the sense that a Negro slave in South Carolina might have been said to tolerate the sale of his wife and children to a planter in Louisiana.”⁵

Given the long tradition of American comparisons of peasants in Russia to blacks in the United States and considering that Wilson’s experiences in the South during Reconstruction contributed to his lifelong discomfort with radical change, I think it is not unreasonable to wonder whether Wilson silently saw an analogy between chaotic revolutionary Russia and the turbulent Reconstruction-era South. But there are more direct reasons to believe that racial attitudes may have influenced Wilsonian policy toward Russia, including three episodes discussed in my book that are not mentioned by Steigerwald.

professor described “the Great Russian” as a friendly, broad-shouldered laborer who was treated more kindly than “overworked negroes” were in the United States.

⁵Kennan, “The Russian People: Repression and Oppression,” *The Outlook*, 18 July 1914, 647-650. Six years earlier, William English Walling tried to refute racial stereotypes by defining Russian peasants as “white,” though he also compared serfdom to slavery and likened peasants’ farms to “the miserable little holdings of our Southern Negroes.” *Russia’s Message: The People Against the Czar* (New York, 1908), 152, 192, 197, 188.

First, consider the context of the December 1917 decisions to withhold recognition of the Bolsheviks and to provide funds for anti-Bolshevik forces in southern Russia. The passage Steigerwald singled out for criticism was preceded and prompted by a paragraph that centered on a December 18, 1917 diary entry by Wilson's Secretary of the Navy, Josephus Daniels. After a Cabinet meeting that day, Daniels recorded his impressions of a telegram Wilson read and Wilson's subsequent comments: "In Petrograd people broke into winter palace and took all wine & got drunk & went round shooting up the town. ... Chaos in Russia. ... Southern Russia the hope. W W wanted to help with money but saw no way with man power unless Roumanian troops could join the Russians who are fighting."⁶ Daniels, it should be remembered, had been a notorious race-baiting newspaper editor in North Carolina who propagated sensational stories of wanton criminality and drunken debauchery by black men to justify their disfranchisement and the reimposition of a white supremacist order.⁷ Since the head of the American military mission to Russia, General William Judson, had commented in a November 1917 report on Russia's descent into "anarchy" that Russians were "mostly ignorant as plantation negroes,"⁸ it does not seem terribly farfetched to suggest that

⁶E. David Cronon, ed., *The Cabinet Diaries of Josephus Daniels* (Lincoln, Neb., 1963), 252, quoted in *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 89-90.

⁷See Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896-1920* (Chapel Hill, 1996), esp. 83, 88; Joseph L. Morrison, *Josephus Daniels Says...* (Chapel Hill, 1962), esp. 114, 165; Morrison, *Josephus Daniels: The Small-d Democrat* (Chapel Hill, 1966), 27-36.

⁸Judson to War College, November 14, 1917, quoted in *America's Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 90.

men like Daniels and Wilson may have made similar comparisons.

Second, consider the advice Wilson received from one of his most trusted informal advisers on Russia, evangelist John R. Mott, around the time he decided to send American troops to North Russia and Siberia. Mott, who felt that Americans had a duty in Russia to spread the light that “dissipates darkness,” had three private meetings with Wilson in July 1918. On July 24, one week after the president authorized military expeditions to “steady” Russian “efforts at self-government,” Mott praised Wilson’s “sympathy with the aspirations of what have been aptly called ‘dark people’ groping after larger light and liberty.”⁹

Third, consider the way Wilson himself linked African Americans to Bolshevism. Sailing across the Atlantic with Wilson in March 1919, the president’s personal physician heard him vent his anxiety that blacks in the United States were becoming more demanding, that black soldiers in France had been placed on the same level as whites and it had “gone to their heads,” and that “the American negro returning from

⁹Mott, “A Review of the Situation in Russia,” January 4, 1918, Wilson *aide-memoire* of July 17, 1918, and Mott to Wilson, July 24, 1918, quoted in *America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 162-3. For a further example of American use of the phrase “dark people,” see *The Dark People: Russia’s Crisis* (New York, 1918), by Ernest Poole, a member of Wilson’s Committee on Public Information. Another intriguing episode came in May 1919, when the Council of four at Paris were considering formal support for anti-Bolshevik Admiral A.V. Kolchak. At that moment junior advisor John Foster Dulles wished that David Lloyd George would tell Wilson “the Admiral is the White Hope of Russia.” Samuel Eliot Morrison Diary, May 10, 1919, quoted in *America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 181.

abroad would be our greatest medium in conveying bolshevism to America.”¹⁰

In my book on American intervention in the Russian Civil War I did not attempt to present a thorough analysis of the role of racial attitudes in American-Russian relations. (I have touched on that theme in recent articles¹¹ and will discuss it in greater depth in forthcoming work.) However, the examples presented here should be sufficient to show that it is not wildly implausible that racial images of Russians subtly suffused Wilsonian policy toward revolutionary Russia.

The fundamental issue raised by Steigerwald’s essay is whether historians of Wilsonian foreign policy should focus narrowly on President Wilson, separating him from his past and isolating him from his contemporaries, or seek to set Wilsonian policies in their wider social, cultural, and historical contexts. In repeatedly criticizing the “tendency to impute to Wilson beliefs that come from someone else” and straining to differentiate an idealistic liberal Wilson from reactionary advisers such as Secretary of State Robert Lansing, Steigerwald (like other neo-Wilsonians) ignores and obscures the attitudes Wilson shared with men who assisted in the formulation and execution of policy toward Russia. Among the sentiments Wilson came to share with Lansing and

¹⁰Cary Grayson Diary, March 10, 1919, quoted in *America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 42. On the wider association of African Americans with “Bolshevism,” see Theodore Kornweibel, Jr., “*Seeing Red*”: *Federal Campaigns Against Black Militancy, 1919-1925* (Bloomington, 1998).

¹¹“Redeeming Russia? American Missionaries in Tsarist Russia, 1886-1917,” *Religion, State and Society*, Vol. 25, No.4 (1997), 353-368; “Roots of Liberation: Visions of the Russian Future Among U.S. Psychological Warfare Advisors, 1948-1953,” *The International History Review* (March 1999).

other aides were disillusionment with moderate socialists involved in the weak Russian provisional government of 1917, doubts about the capacity of the “dark” Russian people for orderly self-government, and belief in the need for strong men to restore order. Those views should be considered against the background of Wilson’s upbringing in the South, his appointment of many Southerners to his Cabinet, the segregationist policies of his administration, the prevailing racial attitudes of his time, and the Wilsonian interventions in Mexico, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, as well as the long tradition of comparing Russian peasants to African Americans.

Having responded to Steigerwald’s request “to be enlightened,” let me ask him to enlighten me about something. In attacking my treatment of Wilson’s decision to send about five thousand U.S. soldiers to northern Russia, Steigerwald claims that “Foglesong takes no note of the allied pressure on Wilson, which is an important omission and telling about how he makes his case.”¹² In fact, however, I address the British and French pressure at several points in my chapter on the expedition to northern Russia. At the beginning of the chapter I note that “The president’s resistance to intervention was .. eroded by repeated appeals from his desperate allies.” Six pages later I note that with the British ambassador’s “persistent lobbying beginning to annoy Wilson,” the French ambassador tried a new approach to gain Wilson’s consent to intervention. And in the middle of the chapter (to cite just one more direct example) I note that “The U.S. agreement to an Allied expedition was .. influenced by pressure from the British and French... .”¹³ In the face of such repeated

¹²Steigerwald, “The Reclamation of Woodrow Wilson?,” 89.

¹³*America’s Secret War Against Bolshevism*, 189, 195, 204.

recognition of the role of Allied pressure, how can Steigerwald assert that I take no note of it? Is it possible that his unfounded claim is in fact more telling about how he tries to make his case in defense of Wilson? If neo-Wilsonian scholars like Steigerwald find it necessary to misrepresent the work of "revisionist" critics of Wilsonian policies, does that indicate that "revisionism" actually has not lost its sting, as Steigerwald claims? Despite his triumphalist pronouncements about "economic globalization and the momentum of political liberalization" having "ushered in a Wilsonian world," is Steigerwald actually not so serene in his faith in the resurrection of Woodrow Wilson?

David S. Foglesong

CLOSED WINDOWS AND OPEN DOORS:
A REPORT ON HOLT SPONSORED RESEARCH
IN THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

by

Xiaodong Wang¹

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Thanks to a Holt Fellowship, I was able to travel in China from October 1998 to January 1999 to collect primary sources for my dissertation on Sino-Soviet-U.S. relations in

¹Xiaodong Wang, a doctoral candidate of the History Department at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, works under the direction of Donald Raleigh, Michael Hunt (dissertation advisor), and Steven Levine (Mansfield Center, University of Montana). He is a fellow of the Social Science and Research Council and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, which have supported his research and writing in the last two years.

Manchuria, 1948 – 1953. Beijing was my first stop. I then visited archives in the Northeast, comprising the three provinces of Heilongjiang, Jilin, and Liaoning. My final sojourn was in Yantai. I found much of what I needed, but there were some unexpected discoveries.

I stayed in Beijing for a month. Several historians working on the Cold War in Asia have blazed the trail of collecting Chinese Communist Party documents. From them I learned that China has made great strides in publishing historical materials. To collect these materials, I visited Beijing's bookstores and publishing houses. At Sanlian, a bookstore with a coffee shop, computer terminals, and internet access, I found several collections of CCP Central Committee documents as well as recent issues of CCP history journals. Some monographs, based on still classified documents, examine topics closely related to my dissertation. I was able to find and talk with some of the authors of these new studies. At the readers' service store of the Dang'an chubanshe [Archival Publishing House], to my great joy, I obtained detailed guidebooks to the four provincial and municipal archives in the Northeast which I had planned to visit. My greatest gain, however, was in the readers' service store of the Zhonggong zhongyang wenxian chubanshe [the press of the CCP Central Committee documents], located in the Maojiawan neighborhood. The store sells biographies and writings of prominent CCP leaders, collections of official documents, and studies by scholars who have access to Chinese archives. Throughout my stay in Beijing, Professor Xue Xiantian and Professor Li Yongqing, both from the Modern History Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, offered valuable help.

Another goal of mine in Beijing was to visit the Zhonggong zhongyang dang'anguan [CCP Central Committee Archives].

In the fall of 1945, the CCP set up a Northeast Bureau. Before an organizational shuffling disbanded it in 1954, the Bureau executed CCP Central Committee policies, reported on conditions in the Northeast, and supervised the work of lower CCP branches as well as state agencies. The Bureau's records, I learned before setting out for China, are now stored in the CCP Central Committee Archives, located in a suburb of Beijing. Armed with an introduction letter from the American Historical Association and accompanied by a prominent Sino-Soviet relations historian, I spent much of a day just finding the way to the Archives. In a village called Beijiatan, located at the end of a poplar-lined boulevard, and surrounded by hills and fruit trees, is a seemingly empty walled compound. At the Reception Room, Zhang Ruizhi, director of the Research Section, accepted my AHA letter, informed us that the Central Committee Archives was off limits to *xuezhe* [scholars], and documents of the Northeast Bureau had been classified as "closed forever." "Try the local archives in the Northeast," she suggested, showing us the door. The whole business took less than fifteen minutes. I thus personally confirmed that the Chinese authorities continue to keep a tight control on research in archives by scholars, foreign or Chinese.

The provinces proved more hospitable to my research. I started with the Heilongjiang Provincial Archives in Harbin, an overnight train ride away from Beijing. Heilongjiang, an archivist educated me, is a border province and its rules of releasing archival materials to researchers are stricter than the ones in the other two Northeastern provinces. On the day of my planned departure from Harbin, however, something unexpected happened. I phoned several factories which the Soviet Union had helped the Chinese build in the 1950s. The director of one of the factories' Propaganda Department told me I could come over and take a look at a recently published

factory history. It turned out that Soviet specialists had been involved in setting up the factory – from selecting a proper site in 1949 to complete its construction in 1952. I pushed my luck and requested to visit the factory’s Archival Department. For the next five days, I read the original contracts and related agreements signed by CCP and Soviet representatives to help China build the factory, lists of names and ranks of Soviet specialists, and housing and grocery costs for their accommodation. The Archive also keeps directives of superior CCP organizations, including the Northeast Bureau and the CCP Central Committee, on how to treat the specialists, how to utilize Soviet experience to build a new China, and what industrial policies to follow.

As if findings at the factory had altered my research fortune in China, work became smoother for me as I traveled on to Changchun, where the Jilin Provincial Archives is located. I made more than 2,000 copies of source materials, ranging from reports on the effect of the Korean War in the Northeast to listings of U.S. properties in the province. The Northeast Bureau, of course, initiated a large portion of these documents. The Liaoning Provincial Archives, located in Shenyang, was less forthcoming, and I was forbidden to copy documents to their full extent. I did find, however, valuable information about the CCP efforts to sinicize Soviet enterprises in the Northeast, such as the Harbin Industrial University and the Qiulin Company. In the Dalian Municipal Archives, the most open and accommodating of all Northeastern archives, I read through detailed records of the city’s Foreign Affairs Bureau, Foreign Trade Bureau, CCP Municipal Committee, and Municipal Authority. Sitting in a brand new and sun lit reading room, I began to regret having spent too many days in Beijing knocking my head against the stone wall of the Central Committee Archives and not having come to Jilin and Dalian earlier.

I ended my China trip in Yantai, across the Bohai Strait from Dalian. Three centers stand out in China today in collecting *wenshiziliao* [Literary and Historical Records], valued by researchers in part for its publication of personal memoirs, often with unorthodox points of view. The Beijing Library and the Library of the Modern History Institute have first rate collections of these records. Professor Li Yongpu, however, has built up the largest and most carefully categorized collection at the Library of the Yantai Normal College. The College officials gave me free and unlimited access to the Library. It also appointed a staff to open the door to the collection for me everyday, as I read through those issues from Northeastern locales.

In sum, the research trip proved fruitful. Despite my failure to gain access to the CCP Central Committee Archives and the Heilongjiang Provincial Archives, I did find valuable information from provincial and municipal archives, which offer me a rich view of the tumultuous years from 1948 to 1953 in the Chinese Northeast. These materials bear out the effects on the Northeast of Central Committee domestic and foreign policy decisions, made in remote Beijing. They also show the CCP's concerns and aspirations in more concrete terms. The drive to remake China, it seems, dictated much of CCP's reconstruction policies and, incidentally, policies with regard to the United States and the Soviet Union. Based on the abundant materials collected during the trip, I now feel confident to describe that drive and its intersection with the Cold War. It was also an exciting experience to travel, for the first time, on the land the history of which I am writing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Call for Papers

Siena College is sponsoring its fifteenth annual, international, multidisciplinary conference on, "The 60th Anniversary of World War II" on June 1-2, 2000. The focus for 2000 will be 1940. Other papers dealing with the issues of the war years will be welcome.

Topics welcomed include, but are not limited to, Fascism and Naziism, the War in Asia, Spain, Literature, Art, Film, Diplomatic, Political and Military History, Popular Culture and Women's and Jewish Studies dealing with the era. Obviously, the Blitzkrieg, England under the Blitz, Dunkirk, Vichy France, Quisling, etc., will be particularly appropriate. Asian, African, Latin American and Near Eastern topics of relevance are also solicited. Send brief outline or abstract of the proposal with some sense of sources, archival materials, etc., consulted and a recent c.v. or brief current biographical sketch. Inquiries from those wishing to Chair and/or Comment are also invited. Deadline for submissions: November 15, 1999

Replies and inquiries to: Professor Thomas O. Kelly, Dept. of History, Siena College, 515 Loudon Road, Loudonville, NY 12211-1462

Phone: (518) 783-2512;

Fax: (518)786-5052

e-mail: legendziewic@siena.edu

CWIHP Working Papers

Christian Ostermann announces that most of the CWIHP Working Papers are now available in PDF format on their website at: <http://cwihip.si.edu> and can be downloaded at no charge.

For further information contact: coldwar1@wwic.si.edu

**Recent Openings
Jimmy Carter Library**

Papers of Jimmy Carter, White House Staff Office Files of Patti DeSouza of the Office of Congressional Liaison, 1977-80 (2 cubic feet). Ms. DeSouza was a member of the Congressional Liaison staff throughout the Carter administration, working first in the Senate Liaison Office and then as Executive Assistant to Frank Moore. A total of approximately 60 feet of material from the Office of Congressional Liaison are now available for research. The remaining 140 feet of the Office of Congressional Liaison files are still closed pending processing.

Papers of Jimmy Carter, White House Staff Office Files of the National Security Adviser, 1977-81 (26 cubic feet added to the 323 feet previously available on request; file totals about 750 cubic feet). The most recent opening provides a researchers a folder title list of the Global Issues File. Subject files are located here for Jessica Tuchman Mathews, Leslie Denend, Lincoln Bloomfield, and Gerald Oplinger. Major subjects include conventional and nuclear arms control, arms sales, weapons of mass destruction, human rights, refugees, the United Nations, the environment, and Law of the Sea negotiations. The folder title list for over forty-five percent of the files of National Security Adviser Abigniew Brzezinski and his staff has been made available to researchers so that they may request the processing of folders of interest. Carter Library staff will then open what can be opened from these folders and submit the security-classified documents for mandatory declassification review. Due to high demand, lengthy delays must be expected in the processing of folders requested.

Call for Papers
First OAH Midwestern Regional Conference
Ames, Iowa

A regional conference will be held on the campus of Iowa State University, August 4-6, 2000. Focusing on the Midwest in two ways - the meeting seeks to bring together American historians located in the Midwest as well as those American historians studying the Midwest.

The Midwestern Conference will not replicate the annual meeting. Ames is a smaller and easy-to-navigate city offering relatively inexpensive lodging and services. The program will emphasize the practice of history both in classrooms and in public settings. Fully a third of the sessions are to be devoted to professional development. Sessions on the latest historiographic approaches to historical problems as well as the most modern teaching strategies will be interlaced with more conventional presentations of new research.

All prospective participants should follow procedures outlined in the *OAH Newsletter*, May 1999, page 9. The deadline for proposals is November 1, 1999. For further information contact: MRC 2000, Organization of American Historians, 112 N. Bryan Ave., Bloomington IN 47408-4199.

Introducing TomPaine.com
Richard Shenkman, Managing Editor

A new journal of opinion, TomPaine.com will make its debut on the internet this summer. The organizers have been frustrated with the shallow, partisan and shrill commentary that often passes for learned discourse in the media. To help correct the balance and add depth they want to present the historian's perspective.

There are any number of ways in which historians can help Americans understand the present better. Here are just two ways. First, you can help expose the politicians who, in the service of their present agendas, misuse history, mangle facts and otherwise misinform americans about the past. For another, you can help journalists see events as historians see them, as part of an ongoing pattern, rather than as a series of discrete episodes, following one after another, as if the world were invented anew every twenty-four hours.

The principal audience is the media establishment in New York and Washington, DC. but TomPaine.com will also be targeting the thousands of editors and publishers across the nation who decide what is news in their communities. Regular running quarter-page ads on the op ed page of the *New York Times* will help reach this elite audience.

If you feel passionate about current events and want a national forum in which you can put them into perspective, TomPaine.com wants to hear from you now. In particular, inform the editors about the subjects in which you are most interested. Then, as these subjects appear in the news you will be called to see if you are willing either to write an op-ed length essay or be interviewed.

Of course, longer articles that you might want to submit are welcome, however remember, this is not a scholarly publication, but a journal of news and opinion. Its success will depend on being timely and topical, as well as fresh and exciting. Keep in mind that the chief audience is journalists and that they, by and large, lead extremely busy lives. They will only have time for articles that either tell them something they do not know or tell them something they do know in a way that is fresh and interesting.

Are you game? If so, please send an e-mail to: historians@tompaine.com (be sure to include a daytime telephone number, your affiliation, and areas of interest). Send news if you

have a book coming out. Also please indicate if you would like to write book reviews.

What else will TomPaine.com do besides history? It will watchdog Washington-based think tanks, elected officials and the news media. It will also seek out and publish the most compelling research studies and opinion writing generated by public interest groups.

TomPaine.com is a project of the Florence fund, a non-profit corporation founded with an initial grant from the Florence and John Schumann Foundation, one of the leading funders of independent media in the United States, including National Public Radio, the Columbia Journalism Review, and public television's Frontline documentary series.

The Importance of Signals Intelligence in Western Europe During the Cold War

The Netherlands Intelligence Studies Association (NIAS) will host an international conference dealing with the importance of signals intelligence among northwestern European nations during the Cold War. The one-day conference will take place on November 27, 1999, in Amsterdam. For information, contact:

Cees Wiebes, Honorary Secretary NIAS, P.O. Box 18 210, 1001 ZC Amsterdam, The Netherlands

E-mail: WIEBES@PSCW.UVA.NL

PUBLICATIONS

Ana Maria Rodriguez Ayçaguer (Montevideo), *Selección de Informes de Los Representantes Diplomáticos de Los Estados Unidos en el Uruguay, Tomo I: 1930-1933*. Facultad de Humanidades y Ciencias de la Educación, Montevideo, 1996.

Joseph P. Baratta (Worcester State), *The United Nations System: Meeting the World Constitutional Crisis*. Oxford: ABC-Clio; New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Press, 1995. ISBN 1-85109-224-2, \$89.95.

Peter Beck (Kingston U., UK), *Scoring for Britain: International Football and International Politics, 1900-1939*. Frank Cass, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-7146-48990x, \$49.50; paper ISBN 0-7146-4454-4, \$24.50.

Kai Bird (Washington, DC), *The Color of Truth: McGeorge & William Bundy - Brothers in Arms - A Biography*. Simon and Schuster, 1998. ISBN 0-684-80970-2, \$27.50.

Günter Bischof (New Orleans), *Cold War Respite: The Geneva Summit of 1955*. LSUP, 1999. ISBN 0-8071023706, \$60.00.

-----and Dieter Stiefel, eds., *80 Dollar: 50 Jahre ERP-Fonds und Marshall-Plan in Österreich 1948-1998* [Your Eighty Dollars: 50 Years of ERP-Fund and Marshall Plan in Austria, 1948-1998]. Vienna: Ueberreuter, 1999.

-----and Rudiger Overmans, eds., *Kriegsgefangenschaft im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Eine Vergleichende Perspektive* [Prisoners of War in World War II: A Comparative Perspective] Ternitz/NÖ: Verlag Gerhard Höller, 1999.

-----, Anton Pelinka and Ferdinand Karlhofer, eds., *The Vranitzky Era in Austria* (Contemporary Austrian Studies, vol. VII) Transaction, 1999). ISBN 0-7658-0490-5, \$35.00.

Lester H. Brune (Bradley - emeritus), *The United States and Post-Cold War Interventions: Bush and Clinton in Somalia, Haiti, and Bosnia*.

Regina Books, 1998. Cloth: ISBN 0941690-86-5; paper: ISBN 0941690-90-3.

Timothy N. Castle (Montgomery) *One Day Too Long: Top Secret Site 85 and the Bombing of North Vietnam*. Columbia, 1999. ISBN 0-213-1-316-6, \$24.95.

Kenton J. Clymer, ed. (Texas, El Paso) *The Vietnam War: Its History, Literature and Music*. Texas Western Press, 1998 (distributed by U. of Texas Press). ISBN 0-87404-277-1, \$15.00.

Edward P. Crapol (William and Mary), *James G. Blaine: Architect of Empire*. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8420-2604-5, \$50.00; paper, ISBN 0-8420-2605-3, \$17.95.

Nick Cullather (Indiana), *Secret History: The CIA's Classified Account of Its Operations in Guatemala, 1952-1954*. Stanford, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8047-3310-4, \$39.50; paper ISBN 0-8047-3311-2, \$14.95.

Jonathan Goldstein (Western Carolina), *The Jews of China, Volume One: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*. M.E. Sharpe, 1998. Paper: ISBN 0-7656-0104-4, \$29.95.

William I. Hitchcock (Yale), *France Restored: Cold War Diplomacy & the Quest for Leadership in Europe, 1944-1954*. Univ. of North Carolina, 1998. ISBN 0-8078-2428-3, \$49.95; paper 0-8078-4747-x, \$18.95.

William G. Hyland (Vienna, VA), *Clinton's World*. Praeger, 1999. Paper: ISBN 0275963969, \$24.95.

Gilbert M. Joseph (Yale), Catherine C. LeGrand (McGill), and Ricardo D. Salvatore, eds., *Close Encounters of Empire*. Duke, 1998. ISBN 0-8223-2099-1, \$19.95.

Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State - Georgetown), *The Long Entanglement*. Praeger, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-275-96418-3, \$65.00; paper: ISBN 0-275-96419-1, \$20.00.

Michael Krenn (Miami), *Black Diplomacy: African Americans & the State Department, 1945-1969*. Sharpe, 1998. Cloth: ISBN 0-7656-0380-2, \$58.95; paper: ISBN 0-7656-0380-2, \$19.95.

Brian McAllister Linn (Texas A&M), *Guardians of Empire*. Univ. of North Carolina, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8078-2321-x, \$39.95; paper: 0-8078-3815-8, \$18.95.

Frank Ninkovich (St. John's), *The Wilsonian Century*. Univ. of Chicago, 1999. ISBN 0-226-58648-0, \$27.50

David Painter (Georgetown), *The Cold War: An International History*. Routledge, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-415-19446-6, \$60.00; paper: ISBN 0-415-1531-6, \$14.99.

Paul G. Pierpaoli, Jr. (Arizona), *Truman and Korea*. Univ. of Missouri, 1999. ISBN 0-8262-1206-9, \$32.50.

Andrew J. Rotter, ed. (Colgate), *Light at the End of the Tunnel: A Vietnam War Anthology*, Revised edition. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8420-2712-2, \$55.00.

Hans L. Trefousse (Brooklyn College, CUNY), *Reconstruction: America's First Effort at Racial Democracy*. Updated version, Krieger, 1999. ISBN 1-57524-035-1, \$17.50.

Timothy Walch (National Archives) and Dwight Miller, *Herbert Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt*. Greenwood, 1998, ISBN 0-313-30608-7, \$59.95.

Tom Zeiler (Colorado at Boulder), *Free Trade, Free World: The Advent of GATT*. North Carolina, ISBN 0-807802458-5, \$39.95.

-----, *Dean Rusk: Defending the American Mission Abroad*. Scholarly Resources, 1999. Cloth: ISBN 0-8420-2685-1, \$50.00; paper: ISBN 0-8420-2686-x, \$17.95

Do you have Conference Papers that should be published?

- √ Editing
- √ Inputting/Scanning
- √ Text Design
- √ Typesetting
- √ Cover Design
- √ Graphics
- √ Preparation of Maps, Charts, Tables
- √ Printing/Binding

If you have conference papers or other collected papers. that warrant publication but cannot find a publisher, RB Author Services may be able to provide a reasonably priced solution to your dilemma. If you have a modest publishing subsidy, it very well may be adequate.

RB Author Services offers a complete book publishing program for projects that merit publication but are denied publication because the market is deemed too limited. If you have the papers on diskettes, we can use these to providing editing, design, typesetting, printing, etc. If you have typescript or photographs, we can scan these onto computer disks.

And—through Regina Books or Paige Press—these books may be offered to college and university libraries.

If you have a manuscript and are interested in our services, please write or fax us, for additional information.

RB AUTHOR SERVICES

(a Division of Regina Books)

P.O. Box 280

Claremont, CA 91711

Telephone (909) 624-8466

Fax (909) 626-1345

CALENDAR

1999

- August 1 Deadline, materials for the September *Newsletter*.
- November 1 Deadline, materials for December *Newsletter*.
- November 1-15 Annual election for SHAFR officers.
- November 1 Applications for Bernath dissertation fund awards are due.
- November 15 Deadline for SHAFR summer conference proposals.
- November 15 Deadline for Myrna F. Bernath Book Award

2000

- January 1 Membership fees in all categories are due, payable at Blackwell Publishers, 350 Main St., Malden MA 02148.
- January 6-9 114th annual meeting of the AHA in Chicago.
- January 15 Deadline for the Bernath Article Award.
- February 1 Deadline for the Bernath Book Award, deadline for March *Newsletter*, and deadline for Ferrell Book Prize.
- February 15 Deadline for the Bernath lecture prize.
- March 1 Deadline for Graebner Prize nominations.
- April 15 Applications for the W. Stull Holt dissertation fellowship are due.
- March 30-April 2 The 93rd meeting of the OAH will take place at the Adam's Mark in St. Louis.
- May 1 Deadline, materials for the June *Newsletter*.
- June 24-27 SHAFR's 26th annual conference will meet in Toronto. Program chair: Jeffrey Smith, History Dept., Queen's U., Kingston, Ontario

The AHA will meet in Boston, January 4-7, 2001; San Francisco, January 3-6, 2002; Chicago, January 2-5, 2003; and Washington, January 8-11.

The 2001 meeting of the OAH will take place at the Westin Bonaventure in Los Angeles, April 26-29. The 2002 meeting will be held in Washington, April 11-14, at the Renaissance Hotel.

PERSONALS

Joseph P. Baratta has been appointed Assistant Professor of History at Worcester State College.

Günter Bischof taught at the University of Salzburg in exchange with Reinhold Wagnleitner in the Spring Semester of 1998.

Marc Gallicchio (Villanova), Norman Graebner (Virginia-emeritus), and Thomas Zeiler (Colorado) received Fulbright awards for 1998-99.

Thomas Schoonover has been awarded the Alfred B. Thomas Prize for the best book by a SECOLAS (South Eastern Council on Latin American Studies) member.

Frank Schumacher (U. of Bonn/Germany) has been appointed Assistant Professor of North American History at the University of Erfurt/Germany.

AWARDS, PRIZES, AND FUNDS

THE STUART L. BERNATH MEMORIAL PRIZES

The Stuart L. Bernath Memorial Lectureship, the Memorial Book Competition, and the Memorial Lecture Prize were established in 1976, 1972, and 1976, respectively, through the generosity of Dr. Gerald J. and Myrna F. Bernath, in memory of their son, and are administered by special committees of SHAFR.

The Stuart L. Bernath Book Prize

DESCRIPTION: This is a competition for a book dealing with any aspect of the history of American foreign relations. The purpose of the award is to recognize and encourage distinguished research and writing by scholars of American foreign relations.

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is to be awarded for a first book. The book must be a history of international relations. Biographies of statesmen and diplomats are included. General surveys, autobiographies, editions of essays and documents, and works which are representative of social science disciplines other than history are *not* eligible.

PROCEDURES: Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations. A nominating letter explaining why the book deserves consideration must accompany each entry in the competition. Books will be judged primarily in regard to their contribution to scholarship. Winning books should have interpretative and analytical qualities of high levels. They should demonstrate mastery of primary material and relevant secondary works, and they should be examples of careful organization and distinguished writing. Five (5) copies of each book must be submitted with the nomination and should be sent to: Doron Ben-Atar, Department of History, Fordham University, Bronx, NY 10458.

Books may be sent at any time during 1999, but should not arrive later than February 1, 2000.

The prize will be divided only when two superior books are so evenly matched that any other decision seems unsatisfactory to the committee. The committee will not award the prize if there is no book in the competition which meets the standards of excellence established for the prize. The 1999 award of \$2,000.00 will be announced at the annual luncheon of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations held in conjunction with the Organization of American Historians' annual meeting in Spring, 2000.

RECENT WINNERS:

1993 Elizabeth Cobbs	1996 Robert Buzzanco
1994 Tim Borstelmann	1997 Carolyn Eisenberg
1995 James Hershberg	1998 Penny Von Eschen
Reinhold Wagnleitner	

The Stuart L. Bernath Lecture Prize

DESCRIPTION: The Bernath Lecture Prize seeks to recognize and encourage excellence in teaching and research in the field of foreign relations by younger

scholars. Prize-winners normally deliver their lecture at the SHAFR luncheon at the annual meeting of the OAH. The lecture is to be comparable in style and scope to the yearly SHAFR presidential address and is to address broad issues of concern to students of American foreign policy, not the lecturer's specific research interests. The award is \$500, with publication of the lecture in *Diplomatic History*.

ELIGIBILITY: The prize is open to any person under forty-one years of age whose scholarly achievements represent excellence in teaching and research. Nominations may be made by any member of SHAFR or any other member of any established history, political science, or journalism department or organization.

PROCEDURES: Nominations, in the form of a short letter and *curriculum vita*, should be sent directly to the Chair of the Bernath Lecture Committee. The nominating letter requires evidence of excellence in teaching and research and must reach the Committee no later than 15 February 2000. The Chairperson of the Committee is: Kathryn Weathersby, 3225 Grace St. NY. Apt. 226, Washington DC 20007-3643.

RECENT WINNERS:

1994 Diane Kunz

1997 Elizabeth Cobbs

1995 Thomas Schwartz

1998 Robert Buzzanco

1996 Douglas Brinkley

The Stuart L. Bernath Scholarly Article Prize

The purpose of the prize is to recognize and to encourage distinguished research and writing by young scholars in the field of diplomatic relations.

ELIGIBILITY: Prize competition is open to any article or essay appearing in a scholarly journal or edited book, on any topic in United States foreign relations that is published during 1999. The author must not be over 40 years of age, or, if more than 40 years of age, must be within ten years of receiving the Ph.D. at the time of acceptance for publication. The article or essay must be among the first six publications by the author. Previous winners of the Stuart L. Bernath Book Award are excluded.

PROCEDURES: All articles appearing in *Diplomatic History* shall be automatically considered without nomination. Other nominations shall be submitted by the author or by any member of SHAFR by January 15, 2000. Three (3) copies of the article shall be submitted to the chairperson of the committee: Gordon Chang, Department of History, Stanford University, Stanford CA, 94305-2024. The award is given at the SHAFR luncheon held in conjunction with the OAH annual meeting.

RECENT WINNERS:

1995 Heike Bungert	1998 Nancy Bernhard
1996 David Fitzsimons	1999 Robert Dean
1997 Robert Vitalis	Michael Latham

The Stuart L. Bernath Dissertation Grant

This grant has been established to help doctoral students who are members of SHAFR defray some of the expenses encountered in the writing of their dissertations.

Requirements are as follows:

1. The dissertation must deal with some aspect of United States foreign relations.
2. Awards are given to help defray costs for dissertation research.
3. Applicants must have satisfactorily completed all other requirements for the doctoral degree.
4. Applications, in triplicate, must include:
 - (a) applicant's vita;
 - (b) a brief dissertation prospectus focusing on the significance of the thesis (2-4 pages will suffice);
 - (c) a paragraph regarding the sources to be consulted and their value;
 - (d) an explanation of why the money is needed and how, specifically, it will be used; and
 - (e) a letter from the applicant's supervising professor commenting upon the appropriateness of the applicant's request. (This should be sent separately to the selection committee chair.)
5. One or more awards may be given. Generally awards will not exceed \$1,500.
6. The successful applicant must file a brief report on how the funds were spent not later than eight months following the presentation of the award (i.e., normally by the following September).

Applications, in triplicate, should be sent to: Susan Brewer, History, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, Stevens Point WI 54481. The deadline for application is November 1, 1999.

RECENT WINNERS:

1994 Delia Pergande	1997 D'Arcy M. Brissman
1995 Amy L. Staples	1998 Max Friedman
1996 David Fitzsimons	

Georgetown Travel Grants

The Bernath Dissertation Grant committee also administers grants to be funded from the SHAFR Georgetown fund to support travel for research in the Washington area. The amounts are determined by the committee.

The Myrna F. Bernath Book and Fellowship Awards

A prize award of \$2,500.00 to be offered every two years (apply in odd-numbered years) for the best book by a woman in the areas of United States foreign relations, transnational history, international history, peace studies, cultural interchange, and defense or strategic studies. Books published in 1998 and 1999 will be considered in 2000. Submission deadline is November 15, 1999. Five copies of each book (or page proofs) must accompany a letter of application. Contact: Katherine Sibley, History Dept., St. Joseph's University, 5600 City Ave., Philadelphia, PA 19131.

PREVIOUS WINNERS

1991 Diane Kunz and Betty Unterberger
1996 Nancy Bernkopf Tucker

An award of \$2500 (apply in even-numbered years), to research the study of foreign relations among women scholars. The grants are intended for women at U.S. universities as well as for women abroad who wish to do research in the United States. Preference will be given to graduate students and newly finished Ph.D's. The subject-matter *should be historically based* and concern American foreign relations or aspects of international history, as broadly conceived. Work on purely domestic topics will not be considered. Applications should include a letter of intent and three copies of a detailed research proposal of no more than 2000 words. Send applications to: Katherine Sibley, Department of History, St. Joseph's University, Philadelphia, PA 19131. Submission deadline is November 15, 2000.

RECENT WINNERS:

1992	Shannon Smith	1997	Deborah Kisatsky
1994	Regina Gramer		Mary Elise Savotte
	Jaclyn Stanke		
	Christine Skwiot		

THE W. STULL HOLT DISSERTATION FELLOWSHIP

The Society of Historians for American Foreign Relations is pleased to invite applications from qualified doctoral candidates whose dissertations are in the field of the history of American foreign relations. This fellowship is intended to help defray costs of travel, preferably foreign travel, necessary to the pursuit of research on a significant dissertation project. Qualified applicants will have satisfactorily completed comprehensive doctoral examinations before April 2000, leaving only the dissertation as the sole, remaining requirement for the doctoral degree.

Applicants should include a prospectus of the dissertation, indicating work already completed as well as contemplated research. The prospectus (8-12 pages, double spaced) should describe the dissertation project as fully as possible, indicating the scope, method, chief source materials, and historiographical significance of the project. The applicant should indicate how the fellowship, if awarded, would be used. An academic transcript showing all graduate work taken to date is required, as well as three letters from graduate teachers familiar with the work of the applicant, including one from the director of the applicant's dissertation.

Applications and supporting papers should be sent before April 15, 2000 to: Elizabeth McKillen, History Dept., 5774 Stevens Hall, University of Maine, Orono ME 04469-5774.

Holt Memorial Fellowships carry awards of \$2000, \$1500, and \$1000. Announcements of the recipients will be made at the Society's annual summer meeting. At the end of the fellowship year the recipient of the fellowships will be required to report to the Committee relating how the fellowship was used. A version of the report of the first-place winner will subsequently be published in the *SHAFR Newsletter*.

RECENT WINNERS:

1994 Christian Ostermann	1998 (1st) Christopher Endy
1995 John Dwyer	(2nd) Richard Wiggers
1996 Philip E. Catton	(3rd) Xiaodong Wang
1997 Max Friedman	

THE NORMAN AND LAURA GRAEBNER AWARD

The Graebner Award is to be awarded every other year at SHAFR's summer conference to a senior historian of United States foreign relations whose

achievements have contributed most significantly to the fuller understanding of American diplomatic history.

CONDITIONS OF THE AWARD: The Graebner prize will be awarded to a distinguished scholar of diplomatic and international affairs. It is expected that this scholar would be 60 years of age or older. The recipient's career must demonstrate excellence in scholarship, teaching, and/or service to the profession. Although the prize is not restricted to academic historians, the recipient must have distinguished himself or herself through the study of international affairs from a historical perspective.

Applicants, or individuals nominating a candidate, are requested to submit three (3) copies of a letter which:

- (a) provides a brief biography of the candidate, including educational background, academic or other positions held and awards and honors received;
- (b) lists the candidate's major scholarly works and discusses the nature of his or her contribution to the study of diplomatic history and international affairs;
- (c) describes the candidate's career, lists any teaching honors and awards, and comments on the candidate's classroom skills; and
- (d) details the candidate's services to the historical profession, listing specific organizations and offices, and discussing particular activities.

Chairman: Chester Pach, History Department, Ohio University, Athens OH 45701.
The deadline for nominations is March 1, 2000.

RECENT WINNERS:

1988 Alexander DeConde
1990 Richard W. Leopold
1992 Bradford Perkins

1994 Wayne Cole
1995 Walter LaFeber
1998 Robert Ferrell

THE WARREN F. KUEHL AWARD

The Society will award the Warren F. Kuehl Prize to the author or authors of an outstanding book dealing with the history of internationalism and/or the history of peace movements. The subject may include biographies of prominent internationalists or peace leaders. Also eligible are works on American foreign relations that examine United States diplomacy from a world perspective and which are in accord with Kuehl's 1985 presidential address to SHAFR. That address voiced an "appeal for scholarly breadth, for a wider perspective on how foreign relations of the United States fits into the global picture."

The award will be made every other year at the SHAFR summer conference. The next award will be for books published in 1999 and 2000. Deadline for submissions is February 1, 2001. Current Chairperson: Mel Small, History, Wayne State U., Detroit MI 48202.

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1987 Harold Josephson

1993 Thomas Knock

1988 Melvin Small

1995 Lawrence S. Witner

1991 Charles DeBenedetti and
Charles Chatfield

**ARTHUR LINK PRIZE
FOR DOCUMENTARY EDITING**

The inaugural Arthur S. Link Prize For Documentary Editing was awarded at the American Historical Association meeting in December 1991. The prize will be offered hereafter whenever appropriate but no more often than every three years. Eligibility is defined by the following excerpt from the prize rules.

The prize will recognize and encourage analytical scholarly editing of documents, in appropriate published form, relevant to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and diplomacy. By "analytical" is meant the inclusion (in headnotes, footnotes, essays, etc.) of both appropriate historical background needed to establish the context of the documents, and interpretive historical commentaries based on scholarly research. The competition is open to the editor/author(s) of any collection of documents published after 1984 that is devoted primarily to sources relating to the history of American foreign relations, policy, and/or diplomacy; and that incorporates sufficient historical analysis and interpretation of those documents to constitute a contribution to knowledge and scholarship. Nominations may be made by any person or publisher. The award is \$500 plus travel expenses to the professional meeting where the prize is presented. For all rules and details contact the committee chair. One copy of each entry should be sent directly to each member of the committee. Current Chairperson: Mary Giunta, NHPRC - Room 300, National Archives, Washington DC 20408.

PREVIOUS WINNERS 1991 Justus Doenecke
1996 John C.A. Stagg

THE LAWRENCE GELFAND - ARMIN RAPPAPORT FUND

The Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations established this fund in honor Lawrence Gelfand, founding member and former SHAFR president and Armin Rappaport, founding editor of *Diplomatic History*. The fund will support

THE SHAFR NEWSLETTER

the professional work of the journal's editorial office. Contact: Allan Spetter, SHAFR Executive Secretary-Treasurer, Department of History, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435.

ROBERT H. FERRELL BOOK PRIZE

This is competition for a book, published in 1998, which is a history of American Foreign Relations, broadly defined, and includes biographies of statesmen and diplomats. General surveys, autobiographies, or editions of essays and documents are not eligible. The prize of \$1,000 is to be awarded as a senior book award; that is, any book beyond the first monograph by the author. The deadline for submission of books is February 1, 2000.

Books may be nominated by the author, the publisher, or by any member of SHAFR. Current chairperson: Robert Johnson, History, Brooklyn College, City University of New York, Bedford Ave. and Avenue H, Brooklyn NY 11210-2889.

PREVIOUS WINNERS:

1992 David Anderson and Diane Kunz	1996 Norman Saul
1994 Mel Leffler	1997 Robert Schulzinger
1995 John L. Harper	1998 Jeffrey Kimball

NATIONAL HISTORY DAY AWARD

SHAFR has established an award to recognize students who participate in the National History Day (NHD) program in the area of United States diplomatic history. The purpose of the award is to recognize research, writing, and relations to encourage a better understanding of peaceful interactions between nations. The award may be given in any of the NHD categories. For information contact: Cathy Gorn, Executive Director, National History Day, 0119 Cecil Hall, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742

The SHAFR Newsletter

SPONSOR: Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee.

EDITOR: William J. Brinker, Box 5154, Cookeville, TN 38505
Tel. (931) 372-3332; e-mail Wbrinker@TNTECH.edu; FAX (931) 372-6142.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: Heather White and Sara Wilkerson.

BACK ISSUES: The *Newsletter* was published annually from 1969 to 1972, and has been published quarterly since 1973. Copies of many back numbers of the *Newsletter* may be obtained from the editorial office for \$2.00 per copy (for members living abroad, the charge is \$3.00).

GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION: The *Newsletter* solicits the submission of personals, announcements, abstracts of scholarly papers and articles delivered or published upon diplomatic subjects, bibliographical or historiographical essays, essays of a "how-to-do-it" nature, information about foreign depositories, biographies, autobiographies of "elder statesmen" in the field, jokes, *et al.* Papers and other submissions should be typed and the author's name and full address should be noted. The *Newsletter* accepts and encourages submissions on IBM-formatted 3½" diskettes. A paper submitted in WordPerfect is preferred. A hardcopy of the paper should be included with the diskette. The *Newsletter* goes to the printer on the 1st of March, June, September, and December; all material submitted for publication should arrive at least four weeks prior.

FORMER PRESIDENTS OF SHAFR

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1968 Thomas A. Bailey (Stanford) | 1984 Warren I. Cohen (Michigan State) |
| 1969 Alexander DeConde (CA-Santa Barbara) | 1985 Warren F. Kuehl (Akron) |
| 1970 Richard W. Leopold (Northwestern) | 1986 Betty Unterberger (Texas A&M) |
| 1971 Robert H. Ferrell (Indiana) | 1987 Thomas G. Paterson (Connecticut) |
| 1972 Norman A. Graebner (Virginia) | 1988 Lloyd Gardner (Rutgers) |
| 1973 Wayne S. Cole (Maryland) | 1989 George Herring (Kentucky) |
| 1974 Bradford Perkins (Michigan) | 1990 Michael Hunt (North Carolina) |
| 1975 Armin H. Rappaport (CA-San Diego) | 1991 Gary Hess (Bowling Green) |
| 1976 Robert A. Divine (Texas) | 1992 John Lewis Gaddis (Ohio) |
| 1977 Raymond A. Esthus (Tulane) | 1993 Warren Kimball (Rutgers-Newark) |
| 1978 Akira Iriye (Chicago) | 1994 Melvyn Leffler (Virginia) |
| 1979 Paul A. Varg (Michigan State) | 1995 Robert Dallek (UCLA) |
| 1980 David M. Pletcher (Indiana) | 1996 Mark Gilderhus (Colorado State) |
| 1981 Lawrence S. Kaplan (Kent State) | 1997 Emily Rosenberg (Macalester) |
| 1982 Lawrence E. Gelfand (Iowa) | 1998 Arnold Offner (Lafayette) |
| 1983 Ernest R. May (Harvard) | |